

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending. Claim 5 is currently canceled. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 9 are currently amended. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in cancelled claim 5.

**Objections**

Claims 5-10 stand objected to as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend upon another multiple dependent claim.

Claim 5 has been cancelled and the dependency of claims 6, 7, and 9 has been amended to be dependent from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above objection be withdrawn.

**§ 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Marsh (US 2,444,520).

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bodde (US 2,242,567).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by James (US 2,905,757).

As currently amended claim 1 recites:

An optical film structure disposed on a light transmission surface of an illumination unit, for modulating light emitted from said illumination unit and projecting modulated light, comprising:

at least two optical films;

at least four optical film fixing parts disposed at an outer peripheral portion of each of said optical films;

a film tension controlling member attached at one of the ends thereof to each of

said film fixing parts in such a fashion as to be capable of pulling each of said optical films under tension while maintaining flatness of said optical films; and

a film fixing frame for fixing said optical films, connected to the other end of said film tension controlling member;

wherein said optical films, said film tension controlling member and said film fixing frame are integrated with one another and are constituted into one component, and wherein said at least two optical films are stacked with a gap between them.

None of Marsh, Bodde, or James teaches the optical film structure as currently claimed, and for example, do not disclose optical film structures comprising at least two optical films, at least four optical film fixing parts, a film tension controlling member attached at one of the ends, thereof to each of said film fixing parts, and a film fixing frame for fixing said optical films, wherein said optical films, said film tension controlling member and said film fixing frame are integrated with one another and are constituted into one component, and wherein said at least two optical films are stacked with a gap between them.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroiwa et al. (US 6,317,180) in view of Marsh. The Examiner submits in part that: Kuroiwa et al. disclose an optical film disposed on a light transmission surface illuminating unit for modulating light emitted from said illumination unit; Kuroiwa et al. do not disclose at least four optical film fixing parts; film tensioning controlling member attached to the fixing parts, a film frame connected to the film tension controlling member, and where the optical film, tension controlling member, and fixing frame are integrated as one component; Marsh discloses at least one optical film, at least four optical film fixing parts, a film tension controlling member, a film fixing frame, and that the optical film, tension controlling member, and fixing frame are integrated as one component.

The optical film structure as now claimed comprises at least two optical films wherein at the least two optical films are stacked with a gap between them. Kuroiwa et al. discloses a liquid crystal device that includes an absorptive polarizer, a liquid crystal cell, a second absorptive polarizer, and a reflective polarizer. At column 5, lines 47-50, Kuroiwa et al. discloses that in an actual device, the respective elements, including optical films, are in close contact with one another without any gaps. Thus, Applicant submits that Kuroiwa et al. teaches away from the invention as now claimed and would not provide any motivation or incentive to one skilled in the art of display devices to combine its teaching with those of Marsh.

Further, Marsh does not teach or suggest multiple optical films having gaps between them. Further still and assuming the references above are combinable, the combination of the references cited above do not teach or suggest the invention as now claimed. For at least these reasons, the above references alone or in combination do not render the invention as claimed obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Examination and reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

June 4, 2007  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Scott A. Bardell  
Scott A. Bardell, Reg. No.: 39,594  
Telephone No.: 651-736-6935

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833